III. REMARKS

Claims 7, 8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 7, 14 and 20 herein; and cancelled claims 1-6, 9, 15 and 21. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims, as previously written, are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Bloom (US Pub. No. 2003/0212678), hereinafter "Bloom", in view of the Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA, at [0003] in the instant application) and further in view of Doganaksoy (US Pub. No. 2004/0083083), hereinafter "Doganaksoy". In the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloom in view of the AAPA and Doganaksoy in further view of Vishnubhotla (US Pub. No. 2002/0147599), hereinafter "Vishnubhotla". Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for reasons explained below.

With respect to claim 7, Applicants submit that even assuming *arguendo* that it is obvious to combine Bloom, applicant (allegedly) admitted prior art, and Doganaksoy, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the claimed features, as is required under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). For example, the cited combination, taken alone or in combination, does not teach or

suggest, evaluating a **set** of data mining algorithms that includes, "selecting the set of data mining algorithms," (emphasis added) as in claim 7.

Independent claims 14 and 20 have been amended with the features previously found in dependent claims 15 and 21. In any event, in support of its rejection of claim 7 with the regards to the aforementioned feature, the Office alleges that the selecting feature is taught at "(Paras 7 or 9)". Office Action, item 2.7.7, page 8. Applicants assume that the Office is referring to paragraphs 7 or 9 in Bloom in support of its rejection. Regardless as to whether the Office is referring to Bloom or Doganaksoy, Applicants contend that neither cited art teaches the aforementioned feature. The cited paragraphs in Bloom do not select a set of algorithms as in the claimed invention.

Further regarding claim 7, Applicants contend that the cited art (i.e., Bloom AAPA, Doganaksoy and Vishnubhotla) does not teach or suggest, selecting that further comprises "selecting a business taxonomy; selecting a business problem based on the business taxonomy; and selecting the set of data mining algorithms based on the business problem."

Referring to the rejection of claim 9, the Office admits that Bloom, AAPA, and Doganaksoy fail to disclose the aforementioned feature. Office Action, item 2.21, page 10. The Office then alleges that Vishnubhotla teaches the claimed feature at paragraphs 10-14. Amongst other features, Applicants fail to find explicit teaching in Vishnubhotla for the selection of a business taxonomy. Based on the paucity of explanation in the rejection, it is unclear to Applicants what specific elements in Vishnubhotla teach or suggest the claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Bloom, AAPA, and Doganaksoy fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. On the basis of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under § 103(a).

With respect to the rejections of independent claims 14, and 20, Applicants note that each of these claims includes features similar in scope to those already addressed above with respect to claim 7. Further, the Office relies on the same arguments and interpretations of Bloom and Doganaksoy as discussed above with respect to claim 7. To this extent, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 14 and 20 for the above-stated reasons.

With further regard to the rejections as a whole, Applicants note that the Office's rejection of claim 9 (now independent claim 7) seeks to combine four different references to support its obviousness rejections. To this extent, Applicants submit that it is unfathomable how the Office can maintain its contention that there is motivation or suggestion in the references themselves or elsewhere to combine such diverse references. This is further accentuated by the fact that each of the references performs a vastly different task. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combinations that underlie the Office's rejections are flawed.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian, Reg. No. 51,560   Date: 24 March 2008

Hoffman, Warnick and D'Alessandro, LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047